

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CECILIO GONZALES,
Petitioner

v.

KATHLEEN ALLISON,
Respondent.

Case No. 2:22-cv-04419-MWF (GJS)

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE
JUDGE**


Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the operative habeas petition [Dkt. 1, “Petition”], all relevant documents filed and lodged in this action, the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge [Dkt. 27, “Report”], and Petitioner’s Objections to the Report [Dkt. 30]. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), the Court has conducted a de novo review of those portions of the Report to which objections have been stated.

Specifically, Petitioner’s four objections generally related to his Ground One, making hyper-technical arguments about his criminal complaint and, now, the Magistrate Judge’s reliance on Lodged Document 1. These objections serve to demonstrate that the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation on Ground One was correct. (Report at 9-11). Ground One is not cognizable on federal habeas corpus because it raises state law issues; is inconsistent with the record (including the

1 waiver of a reading of the complaint, among other things); and does not begin to
2 raise an issue under AEDPA.

3 Having completed its review, the Court accepts the findings and
4 recommendations set forth in the Report. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that: the
5 Petition is DENIED; and Judgment shall be entered dismissing this action with
6 prejudice.

7
8 Dated: August 10, 2023

9 
10 MICHAEL W. FITZGERALD
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28